

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. In response to the amendments received on 03/03/2008, objection to claim 19 and 112 second paragraph rejection of claim 89 have been withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's argument regarding the 112 first paragraph rejection of claims 124, 126-120, and 132 has been fully considered but it is not persuasive.

Applicant's Argument: Applicant argues that since the exact filter is a type of error filter, one may use the exact filter in the same manner as an error filter.

Examiner's Response: Examiner asserts that since there is no explanation on exact filter's nature provided by the Applicant in invention's disclosure and using an exact filter as an error filter is not well known in the art, therefore, the claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

3. Applicant's argument regarding the rejection of claims 74, 75, 80, 85, 91, 93, and 94 has been fully considered but it is not persuasive.

Applicant's Argument: Applicant argues that claim 74 substantially corresponds to allowed claim 49, and therefore it is allowable over the cited reference for at least similar reasons as claim 49.

Examiner's Response: Examiner respectfully disagrees. Although claims 49 and 74 have some similar limitations, however there is at least one major difference between

Art Unit: 2611

claim 49 and claim 74 in part C. In claim 74, part C Applicant recites: means for providing a filtered error term for updating said filtering coefficients from said equalized data signal and an ideal equalized data signal". However Applicant in claim 49, recites: an error term circuit, configured to receive said equalized data output and provide a filtered error term for updating said filter coefficients from a filtered equalized data output and a filtered ideal equalized data output. Therefore in claim 74, the data output is only equalized, however in claim 49, the data output is equalized and filtered.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LEILA MALEK whose telephone number is (571)272-8731. The examiner can normally be reached on 9AM-5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mohammad Ghayour can be reached on 571-272-3021. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2611

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Leila Malek
Examiner
Art Unit 2611

/L. M./
/Leila Malek/
Examiner, Art Unit 2611

/Mohammad H Ghayour/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2611